

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : 10/631,259
Applicant : Hsieh et al.
Filed : August 1, 2003
Group Art Unit: 3714
Examiner : Cameron Saadat
Title : **PHYSICAL PROGRAMMING TOY**
Docket No. : LGTY-100

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2007

Certificate of Transmission by Facsimile

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to Fax No. (571) 273-8300 to:
Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

August 20, 2007


Ronald L. Yin

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW OF AUGUST 9, 2007

M/S Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Official communication mailed on August 14, 2007, Applicants hereby provide a Statement of Substance of Interview of August 9, 2007.

Specifically and as stated in the amendment to the Final Office Action faxed by Applicants on August 12, 2007, the interview discussed the following:

1. A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted — none. No exhibit was shown nor was any demonstration conducted.
2. An identification of the claims discussed. Claims 21 and 33 were discussed.
3. An identification of the specific prior art discussed. "Tangible Computation Bricks: Building-blocks for Physical Microworlds" ("McNerney").

LGTY-100

4. An identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner – See amendment after final rejection faxed on August 14, 2007, wherein amendment to claims 21 and 33 are proposed. Applicants have also amended claims 34-37.

5. A brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner – As set forth in the Amendment after the Final Rejection faxed on August 14, 2007, the failure of McNerney is in its use of a microprocessor with its associated memory in EACH stackable block. The examiner contended that this distinction is not set forth in the claims, suggesting that if such difference were embodied in the claims then such distinction would overcome McNerney. See Response to Arguments (page 5), wherein the examiner stated, “[T]he examiner recognizes applicant’s emphasis that the claimed blocks consist of memory and do not include microprocessors. However, these limitations are not claimed.”

In the response to the Office Action of March 5, 2007, applicants added the limitation of “for execution by a computer external to said block” to distinguish over McNerney and to emphasize the difference between the claims and McNerney, namely each block contains a memory storing program instruction(s) but the program instruction(s) are not executed by a computer within the block. The examiner rejected this difference stating that this is merely a “functional limitation.” In an effort to further clarify this language, the limitation has been made into an express structural limitation.

6. A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed – none

7. If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner. The examiner indicated that he will wait for the proposed Amendment after Final to be submitted by the Applicants for further consideration.

FROM : PEGGY TUN

FAX NO. : 650 968 5241


Aug. 20 2007 08:54PM P3

LGTY-100

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2007

By



Ronald L. Yin
Reg. No. 27,607
Attorney for Applicants

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2007

Ronald L. Yin
547 Sullivan Drive
Mountain View, CA. 94041